

**UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL  
on  
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

**IN RE: JOHNSON & JOHNSON TALCUM POWDER  
PRODUCTS MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES  
AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

MDL No. 2738

**TRANSFER ORDER**

**Before the Panel:**\* Plaintiffs in the four actions listed on Schedule A move under Panel Rule 7.1 to vacate our orders that conditionally transferred the actions to the District of New Jersey for inclusion in MDL No. 2738. Defendants Johnson & Johnson, Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc., and Imerys Talc America, Inc., oppose the motions.

In support of their motions to vacate, plaintiffs argue that federal subject matter jurisdiction is lacking, and plaintiffs' motions to remand to state court are pending. The Panel has held that jurisdictional issues generally do not present an impediment to transfer, as plaintiffs can present these arguments to the transferee judge.<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., *In re Prudential Ins. Co. of Am. Sales Practices Litig.*, 170 F. Supp. 2d 1346, 1347-48 (J.P.M.L. 2001). Plaintiffs in the *Moore* action pending in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania also argue that transfer of *Moore* is not appropriate because that action involves a different named defendant than the other actions pending in the MDL and different applicable state law. Transfer under Section 1407 does not require a complete identity of factual issues or parties as a prerequisite to transfer when the actions arise from a common factual core. See *In re 100% Grated Parmesan Cheese Mktg. & Sales Practices Litig.*, 201 F. Supp. 3d 1375, 1378 (J.P.M.L. 2016).

Therefore, after considering the argument of counsel, we find that these actions involve common questions of fact with the actions transferred to MDL No. 2738, and that transfer under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 will serve the convenience of the parties and witnesses and promote the just and efficient conduct of the litigation. In our order centralizing this litigation, we held that the District of New Jersey was an appropriate Section 1407 forum for actions sharing factual questions arising from allegations that plaintiffs or their decedents developed ovarian or other gynecological cancer

---

\* Judge Lewis A. Kaplan took no part in the decision of this matter. Additionally, one or more Panel members who could be members of the putative classes in this docket have renounced their participation in these classes and have participated in the decision.

<sup>1</sup> Panel Rule 2.1(d) expressly provides that the pendency of a conditional transfer order does not limit the pretrial jurisdiction of the court in which the subject action is pending. Between the date a remand motion is filed and the date that transfer of the action to the MDL is finalized, a court generally has adequate time to rule on a remand motion if it chooses to do so.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original on file in my office.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY  
WILLIAM T. WALSH, CLERK


By  Deputy Clerk

-2-

following perineal application of Johnson & Johnson's talcum powder products (namely, Johnson's Baby Powder and Shower to Shower body powder). *See In re Johnson & Johnson Talcum Powder Prods. Mktg., Sales Practices & Prods. Liab. Litig.*, MDL No. 2738, \_\_ F. Supp. 3d \_\_, 2016 WL 5845997 (J.P.M.L. Oct. 4, 2016). Plaintiffs do not dispute that their actions share multiple factual issues with those already in the MDL.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the actions listed on Schedule A are transferred to the District of New Jersey and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Freda L. Wolfson for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings.

PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION



---

Sarah S. Vance  
Chair

Marjorie O. Rendell  
Ellen Segal Huvelle  
Catherine D. Perry

Charles R. Breyer  
R. David Proctor

**IN RE: JOHNSON & JOHNSON TALCUM POWDER  
PRODUCTS MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES  
AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

MDL No. 2738

**SCHEDULE A**

Eastern District of Missouri

GHORMLEY, ET AL. v. JOHNSON & JOHNSON, ET AL., C.A. No. 4:17-00585  
KRUEGER, ET AL. v. JOHNSON & JOHNSON, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 4:17-00839  
HENSLEY, ET AL. v. JOHNSON & JOHNSON, ET AL., C.A. No. 4:17-00972

Eastern District of Pennsylvania

MOORE, ET AL. v. JOHNSON & JOHNSON, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:17-01164